

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MEETING  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD  
LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

COPY

Board Room  
8800 Cal Center Drive  
Sacramento, California

Friday, May 3, 1996  
9:30 a.m.

Janet H. Nicol  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
License Number 9764

APPEARANCESCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Wesley Chesbro, Committee Chairman  
Robert C. Frazee  
Janet Gotch

STAFF PRESENT:

Nancy Carr  
Maureen Carr Morrison  
Judith Friedman  
Tracey Harper  
Kathy Marsh, Committee Secretary  
Claire Miller  
Bill Orr  
Dorothy Rice, Chief Deputy Director  
John Sitts

PUBLIC SPEAKERS:

John Cupps  
John Febbo, Sacramento County  
Dr. Eugene Tseng, UCLA

INDEXPAGE

Proceedings	1
Roll Call	1
Agenda Item No. 1, Report from DPLA Division	2
Agenda Item No. 2, Report from WPMD Division	7
Agenda Item No. 3, Consent Agenda	13
Agenda Item No. 8, Sacramento County	14
Agenda Item No. 10, City of Carlsbad	22
Agenda Item No. 11, City of Coronado	26
Agenda Item No. 17, Uniform Waste Characterization Method	30
Reporter's Certificate	58

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Good morning,  
everybody. This is the meeting of the Local Assistance and  
Planning Committee of the California Integrated Waste  
Management Board.

Before we start, there's one item of housekeeping  
and that is that Item 18 has been pulled from the agenda. I  
wanted to announce that.

And that being said, let me remind any member of  
the public who is here that doesn't already know that we  
have copies of the consent agenda, which we'll take up in a  
moment, back at the back table and also that there are  
speaker request slips which help us identify who wants to  
talk to the Board, so please get one of those and fill it  
out and provide it to the committee's assistant, Kathy  
Marsh, up here.

The first item on the agenda is the oral report of  
the Diversion, Planning and Local Assistance Division by  
deputy director Judy Friedman.

No, roll call. Hold on. We'll call the roll,  
please.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY MARSH: Board Members Frazee.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY MARSH: Gotch.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: Here.

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY MARSH: Chairman Chesbro.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Here.

3 Now we will proceed with the report.

4 My excuse is that it's Friday and I had to put a  
5 tie on.

6 MS. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Good morning, Chairman  
7 Chesbro and Committee Members Frazee and Gotch.

8 This item is an update on some of the major  
9 activities of the Diversion, Planning and Local Assistance  
10 Division.

11 First, some information on local plans.

12 Elements of 13 jurisdictions are on today's agenda  
13 and that is a combination of SRREs, HHWEs and NDFEs, and  
14 this represents 19 individual elements.

15 As of May 1st the Board has received approximately  
16 1300 locally-adopted elements of the countywide plans for  
17 consideration of approval, disapproval or conditional  
18 approval.

19 If the Board adopts staff's recommendation after  
20 this month's Board meeting, the Board will have approved 377  
21 SRREs, conditionally approved 56, and disapproved five. And  
22 you're going to like this, this is an approximately 99  
23 percent approval, conditional approval rate and a one  
24 percent disapproval rate. So we continue to improve our  
25 statistics.

1           At this time we have not received SRREs for 55  
2 jurisdictions.

3           Other planning issues.

4           Staff from the Office of Local Assistance attended  
5 the Governor's Rural Development Council meeting in April  
6 and presented information to the council regarding the  
7 Board's marketing update of recyclables, innovative  
8 composting bin distribution programs in rural communities,  
9 an update on Board decisions regarding the petition for  
10 reduction policy and a comparison of tipping fees at  
11 landfills and transfer stations prepared by the Board's  
12 Economic Forecasting section.

13           On April 11th staff from the Office of Local  
14 Assistance and the Waste Prevention and Market Development  
15 Division met with John Locke from the San Diego Naval Base  
16 Office of Regional Environmental Coordination, which is  
17 responsible for environmental issues at naval facilities  
18 throughout California.

19           The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the  
20 Board's programs to the military representatives who can in  
21 turn pass the information on to the respective solid waste  
22 managers.

23           Staff presented information on the coordination of  
24 city-county diversion programs and military programs,  
25 disposal reporting requirements for jurisdictions, Project

1 Recycle, waste audits for contracts for businesses and base  
2 closure activities.

3 It has been interesting to note that since this  
4 meeting we have been getting calls from around the country  
5 from different military base personnel, so we seem to have  
6 reached the right level in the military organization and now  
7 we're getting asked for requests for assistance from around  
8 the country.

9 Planning staff will be attending the Solid Waste  
10 Association of North America, or SWANA, to present landfill  
11 siting strategy ideas to the Legislative Task Force  
12 Committee and to Local Government Technical Advisory  
13 Committee for their comment. These strategies are being  
14 developed to assist local government in ensuring adequate  
15 landfill capacity.

16 In addition, staff will be presenting information  
17 on disposal reporting and waste characterization at the  
18 conference and that is scheduled for May 13th through 16th  
19 in South Lake Tahoe.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Actually it's  
21 technically across the state line; right?

22 MS. FRIEDMAN: Technically.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Which for a State  
24 employee creates a big headache unnecessarily.

25 MS. FRIEDMAN: No cost to be incurred across state

1 lines.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I guess if you're a  
3 participant you don't have to pay, as a speaker or whatever.

4 MS. FRIEDMAN: Office of Local Assistance staff  
5 continue to work with professors from San Diego State, San  
6 Francisco State and the University of Nevada, Reno, to  
7 disseminate information to jurisdictions about free energy  
8 and waste audits engineering students do for businesses.

9 Staff met with the California Energy Commission  
10 staff to discuss presentations in the upcoming workshops on  
11 the Industrial Assessment Center audits program. Staff is  
12 working on the waste audit portion of the Industrial  
13 Assessment center workshops in San Diego, San Jose,  
14 Sacramento and Redding and these workshops are to be  
15 scheduled for August of this year.

16 Some update on regulations.

17 Staff has begun the second informal review and  
18 comment period for the draft material type definition  
19 regulations. The draft regulations have been distributed to  
20 the Board's working group for an internal review period,  
21 which will be followed by a meeting to discuss staff  
22 comments.

23 After the internal comments are incorporated, the  
24 draft regulations will be distributed to staff from cities,  
25 counties and industry for their review on an informal basis.

1 Update on used oil and household hazardous waste.

2 As of May 1st the total number of certified  
3 centers is 1,921, so we're approaching 2,000 certified  
4 centers. We have 475 industrial generators and 67 curbside  
5 programs. For the month, or since April 1st we have  
6 certified 60 centers, recertified 97, registered ten  
7 industrial generators, one curbside program.

8 The award letter on used oil block grants was sent  
9 to 192 jurisdictions at the beginning of this month and the  
10 Board had approved these grants during the March Board  
11 meeting.

12 Some update on Project Recycle.

13 Staff assisted in initiating 35 new recycling  
14 programs at State facilities. These facilities included  
15 State offices, maintenance stations, community colleges and  
16 one state prison.

17 Staff is working with the State Lottery Commission  
18 and Weyerhaeuser to recycle large volumes of shredded  
19 lottery tickets as well.

20 And this concludes my presentation.

21 Are there any questions?

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Any questions from  
23 committee members?

24 Exciting progress on a number of fronts. Thank  
25 you very much for your report.

1           Next we'll have the oral report of the Waste  
2 Prevention and Market Development Division, which will be  
3 presented this morning by Bill Orr.

4           MR. ORR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good  
5 morning committee members.

6           I'm excited to be here this morning because we're  
7 going to have sort of a multimedia presentation.

8           The first thing I'd like to do is direct your  
9 attention to your monitors, where you can see a building at  
10 the Presidio. And during the last month staff conducted  
11 three site visits to the Presidio to follow up on the  
12 progress of two hand demolition salvaging projects that are  
13 currently underway.

14           This first picture is sort of a before picture and  
15 it shows an administration building that is at the very  
16 beginning stages of being deconstructed.

17           This second photograph here shows -- well, first  
18 of all you can notice the Golden Gate Bridge in the  
19 background, so you can get an idea of where exactly the  
20 barrack or the building is, and you'll notice that they're  
21 getting quite a bit of dimensional lumber and so forth and  
22 they're stacking it up. And basically all of the lumber  
23 that they've got, they're separating it out, has either been  
24 purchased or is spoken for, and you'll get an idea of what  
25 that looks like or what the end of the building looks like

1 in a minute.

2 Here we're finally getting down to the skeleton of  
3 the building and all these piles of wood out in front have  
4 all been purchased.

5 In addition to these photographs, staff has also  
6 videotaped the deconstruction and it will be available for  
7 distribution in the future for interested parties.

8 Okay. Also on the C and D front, staff  
9 participated in the second Bay Area Conversion Action Team  
10 meeting in Oakland. In this roundtable discussion  
11 representatives from local reuse authorities, the U.S. Army,  
12 Navy, U.S. EPA, private business, nonprofits, State  
13 government, UC, local recyclers and business development  
14 agencies spoke of their needs and desires with respect to  
15 base closure, business development and materials reuse and  
16 recycling.

17 Staff is coordinating with the Alameda Naval Air  
18 Station Base Reuse Authority to document the activities  
19 connected to the demolition contract due to be advertised in  
20 late April. That sort of came out and was discussed at that  
21 meeting.

22 Also like to share with you that staff has  
23 finalized preparations for the U.S. EPA, ICMA, CIWMB,  
24 MegaMatch workshop that's going to be held in San Francisco.  
25 I've got brochures here. Pass those around.

1           This is actually the second one of these MegaMatch  
2 workshops. As some Board members may recall, the last  
3 MegaMatch workshop is where the Board's business waste  
4 reduction kits were debuted about a year and a half ago.

5           This particular workshop will focus on unit  
6 pricing and waste prevention programs and the specific  
7 sessions that will be included include unit base pricing  
8 focused on weight-based measurement, cost analysis and  
9 ratesetting tools, yard waste reduction, mini materials  
10 exchanges, business waste reduction and green procurement.

11           The keynote speaker for the conference is  
12 scheduled to be Dr. William Rathje from the University of  
13 Arizona. And registration is \$30 and includes lunch.

14           The next thing I'd like to share with you is  
15 another series of workshops. Staff has been working with  
16 Local Government Commission to finalize a video on material  
17 exchange facilities, or MEFs, for three MEF workshops that  
18 will be held in May. Featured in the video are scenes from  
19 functioning MEFs around California, as well as MEF  
20 operators. Both publicly- and privately-operated facilities  
21 are depicted.

22           And this video will be debuted at the MEFs  
23 workshops. You're actually going to get a prescreening of  
24 the beginning of that video here in a minute.

25           Copies will be available to communities for use

1 while considering the establishment of similar programs.

2 And I think with that I'm going to go ahead and  
3 start the video.

4 (Thereupon a videotape was shown.)

5 MR. ORR: I'm going to go ahead and stop the video  
6 at this point.

7 But the video does go on to feature segments on  
8 Art from Scrap in Santa Barbara, as well as Omega Hardware  
9 in Berkeley. And this will be the center piece of a series  
10 of three workshops that will be conducted. Two of them are  
11 next week, one in Marina on May 7th, excuse me, Berkeley on  
12 May 7th, Marina on May 9th and then in San Diego on May  
13 20th. Copies of the flyer for the workshops have been  
14 distributed to Board members. If you need any additional  
15 ones, let us know.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: And you'll make the  
17 video available to us to watch the rest of it when we get a  
18 chance?

19 MR. ORR: Sure. Absolutely.

20 Carrying on, I'd like to also indicate that staff  
21 has added an additional program to the Train the Trainer  
22 program established through the existing master gardener  
23 network of the U.C. Cooperative Extension. Participants in  
24 this program will be trained as master composters and in  
25 turn will teach others to compost. The addition of San

1 Bernardino brings the total to seven master composter  
2 training programs and in this new public-private partnership  
3 program. The results of this effort will be available in  
4 October.

5 Another video activity that's currently going on  
6 is yard waste prevention staff is working with major chain  
7 video stores to gain approval for the placement of the  
8 Board's video, "Taking Care of Your Own, Composting for the  
9 '90s," in video stores. The stores are very interested in  
10 placing the video and they are now looking into the means to  
11 distribute and the proper category to place the video.

12 Coinciding with the distribution of this video  
13 will be its placement in local libraries statewide.

14 And then finally I wanted to report on the Source  
15 Reduction Measurement Roundtable that I attended in  
16 Washington, D.C. on April 18th and 19th.

17 As you may recall, this was originally scheduled  
18 for January, but was snowed out at the time.

19 The three major outcomes of the workshop.

20 First of all it became evident that California has  
21 become the national leader in the measurement of source  
22 reduction or, as we call it, waste prevention. As a result  
23 of staff efforts and also the efforts of UCLA, who is going  
24 to be speaking later in the meeting, California has eclipsed  
25 the states of Minnesota, New York, and Kings County,

1 Washington, in this area and we relied on lot on the  
2 materials that had been previously developed by these states  
3 and counties as we initiated our efforts, but it's clear  
4 that we've gone beyond what they've done at this point.

5 The second thing that was exciting to find out  
6 about is that there is a potential of U.S. EPA funding and  
7 national promotion of the Waste Prevention Information  
8 Exchange and the Board's Waste Prevention World home page.

9 Participants requested that a central repository  
10 be set up for source reduction and staff was quick to point  
11 out that the Waste Prevention Information Exchange already  
12 serves this purpose.

13 U.S. EPA indicated that they may be able to  
14 provide us with assistance to input additional information  
15 and documents from other states and to respond to increased  
16 inquiries that could come from around the country. U.S. EPA  
17 would then market the service nationally.

18 And finally in regard to the workshop, it was  
19 discussed that source reduction is in many states considered  
20 the highest tier of the waste management hierarchy, but many  
21 of the representatives were lamenting that it is rarely  
22 supported with resource allocations commensurate with this  
23 priority. A number of the participants were almost  
24 apologetic for the level of funding and staffing and  
25 expressed that they felt that measurement of source

1 reduction was the key to increased allocations.

2 And I think I'll conclude my report there.

3 Are there any questions?

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Any questions?

5 Once again, very upbeat report. A lot of positive  
6 things happening.

7 Thanks.

8 Okay. The next item is Item 3, which is  
9 consideration of consent agenda items. And the items that  
10 are on consent are Items 4 through 7, and the Household  
11 Hazardous Waste Element for Item 8, Item 9, the Household  
12 Hazardous Waste Element for Item 10, and Items 12 through  
13 16. Is that a complete list? Okay.

14 The motion would be to accept staff recommendation  
15 for approval of these items and approve the consent agenda  
16 and forward it to the Board for the Board's consent agenda,  
17 unless there are any items that either of you would like to  
18 have pulled for separate discussion.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: No. I move we accept the  
20 consent agenda.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Been moved.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Second.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Seconded.

24 Can we call the roll, please?

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY MARSH: Board Members Frazee.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Aye.

2 COMMITTEE SECRETARY MARSH: Gotch.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: Aye.

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY MARSH: Chairman Chesbro.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Aye.

6 Motion carries.

7 For some reason, that slide projector has a light  
8 that's shining right in my eyes. I guess it can't be seen  
9 up here, but it's blinding me. Thank you.

10 Okay. On the regular agenda we have Item 8, which  
11 is consideration of staff recommendation of the adequacy of  
12 the previously disapproved SRRE for the unincorporated area  
13 of Sacramento County.

14 And before staff presents this, I just want to say  
15 that I am very very pleased with the progress that the  
16 County's made and it's real obvious that they've taken the  
17 process seriously and made more than a good faith effort to  
18 get this thing up and running. So I'm personally very happy  
19 about it as a user of Sacramento County's diversion  
20 programs. I've always been very impressed with their  
21 program implementation. And there's some frustration with  
22 the fact that the planning stuff was lagging to some degree,  
23 but I think this will be resolved when the Board approves  
24 this SRRE.

25 So with that, Ms. Friedman.

1 MS. FRIEDMAN: Good morning, again.

2 I really can't add anything to that. I think  
3 you've said it all. And I note that there's several staff  
4 here from Sacramento County. They may wish to speak at some  
5 point in the presentation.

6 And with that I'm going to turn it over to Tracey  
7 Harper with the Office of Local Assistance.

8 MS. HARPER: Good morning, committee members,  
9 Chairman Chesbro.

10 Today's item is the consideration of staff  
11 recommendation for the previously disapproved Source  
12 Reduction and Recycling Element from the unincorporated area  
13 of Sacramento County.

14 As you may recall, back in December in 1994 this  
15 committee and the Board disapproved the County's SRRE due to  
16 significant planning inadequacies.

17 As delineated in the correspondence dated January  
18 12, 1995, the inadequacies included the year 2000 projection  
19 of 45.8 percent, which was falling short of the 50 percent  
20 mandate; the lack of diversion programs for the medium-term  
21 planning period; an inadequate 15-year disposal capacity  
22 projection; an inadequate description of funding for  
23 diversion programs and an inadequate integration component,  
24 which included the master implementation schedule.

25 On June 16th, 1995, the Board received a written

1 request from the County to extend the deadline by which a  
2 revised SRRE was to be submitted according to statute.

3 This committee at its July 12th meeting directed  
4 staff to work with the County staff in preparing a  
5 compliance schedule for submittal of an approved SRRE.

6 On July 25th, 1995, the Board approved Resolution  
7 95-606, which granted an extension of time until February  
8 10th of this year for submittal of a revised SRRE.

9 It is noteworthy that the final SRRE was submitted  
10 to the Board over a month ahead of schedule. The SRRE was  
11 received by the Board on January 5th of this year.

12 The new final SRRE includes a diversion rate for  
13 the year 2000 of 50.1 percent. And the County plans to  
14 reach this goal through a comprehensive effort which, among  
15 other programs, includes curbside recycling, including mixed  
16 paper, magazine and soon yard waste.

17 John Febbo, as Judy mentioned, the County staff,  
18 is here, is far better equipped to speak to the programs  
19 that they're planning and implementing currently than I am.

20 And in case I haven't mentioned here, through  
21 review of the revised SRRE as well as more supplemental  
22 materials which were submitted after that, they have  
23 fulfilled and met all the requirements to have an approved  
24 SRRE, which is contained in the agenda item.

25 Through the past year or so we have developed a

1 successful and cooperative and good working relationship  
2 with the County. We've been working closely together to  
3 come to this point today.

4 And it's with pleasure that I recommend approval  
5 of the Source Reduction and Recycling Element.

6 And I believe John Febbo is prepared to come  
7 forward.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. John.

9 MR. FEBBO: Good morning, Chairman, members of the  
10 Board.

11 I'll be real brief. You've heard us up here on a  
12 lot of occasions talking about the program, so I'm going to  
13 spend less than five minutes just telling you what we've  
14 done in last year and what we're going to be doing in 1996.

15 The last year we've added mixed paper and  
16 magazines to all of our 160,000 curbside recycling accounts.

17 We have expanded our waste audit program  
18 significantly. We're going into a lot of businesses. We  
19 have couple staff dedicated to doing waste audits and  
20 following up with the businesses and actually hooking them  
21 up with local recycling companies and starting the papers  
22 and cardboard and stuff like that.

23 We've lowered our rate at the landfill for inert  
24 materials including brick, rock, concrete, asphalt, tile and  
25 stuff like that and we now have a contract in place with a

1 inert processing company. And we're going to reuse a lot of  
2 that stuff on site for all-weather pads and landings and  
3 roads. We've expanded our inert recycling effort.

4 This is some of the major, just the major programs  
5 we've done in the last six months to a year.

6 The next year we can look forward to our green  
7 waste program. In the fall of '96 we'll be adding a  
8 separate collection of green waste for 40,000 homes. That's  
9 about 25 percent of our customer base. We already have  
10 about 8,000 homes on the pilot program. That's the first  
11 phase of three phases to ultimately bring a curbside  
12 collection of green waste to the entire county and that will  
13 really help us with getting 50 percent.

14 We are in the process of developing regulations  
15 for a solid waste authority board ordinance to require  
16 commercial private haulers to divert waste over a gradual  
17 period over the next three or four years, culminating with  
18 30 percent diversion by 1999. That will be in addition to  
19 the already 15 to 20 percent diversion they're doing now.  
20 That's another program that will help us get to 50. And  
21 that will be in effect for all the private haulers in both  
22 the City and County of Sacramento. That's a solid waste  
23 authority regional board.

24 We're going to expand our wood waste recycling  
25 efforts at our three facilities, including the two transfer

1 stations. We're just about to enter into a new contract for  
2 that program and we're going to try to raise the tonnage a  
3 lot in that program. And that's just some of the stuff  
4 we'll be doing, major programs in the next few years.

5 And I'd just like to reiterate that we're  
6 committed to meeting the mandates of AB 939 and we've  
7 enjoyed their relationship, working with staff in the last  
8 six months. It's been real positive. They've been real  
9 helpful. A lot of Friday afternoon calls and getting things  
10 set up for moving the process along so we could get it in as  
11 fast as we could. So we appreciate working with them.

12 That's about it.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Great. Any  
14 questions?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: I do have just one.

16 Your green waste pickup, is that going to be  
17 containerized or the City of Sacramento's --

18 MR. FEBBO: No. It's going to be a containerized  
19 pickup. We're going to provide new containers. In fact  
20 giving the -- planning to give the residents 90-gallon --  
21 they have 90-gallon containers right now. We're going to  
22 give them 60-gallon containers for their garbage and utilize  
23 the 90 for the green waste.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Okay. Great.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: When did, you

1 probably said this and I missed it, but when do you expect  
2 that to be fully operational?

3 MR. FEBBO: The first phase will be fall of 1996.  
4 Right now the schedule for the second phase is fall of '97  
5 and the third and final phase would be fall of '98 and we'd  
6 have all 160,000 accounts being serviced by then.

7 And the indications from the pilot program are  
8 that it's going to result in a lot of diversion and really  
9 get us close to 50 percent.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Any other questions?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: No. Good news.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: In addition to the  
13 obvious commitment of County staff there was somewhat  
14 unusual, compared to other jurisdictions, the interest that  
15 the elected officials took. I had conversations with a  
16 number of members of the Board of Supervisors and other  
17 members of the authority.

18 And I would like to have us respond with some sort  
19 of correspondence to the board, both the Board of  
20 Supervisors and the authority board, I think, indicating  
21 we're pleased with the progress that was made. I think that  
22 would be worth higher level of recognition, given the fact  
23 of how quickly we have come in such a short period of time.

24 The other comment I would make, Judy was  
25 mentioning earlier that we've got 99 percent approval rate,

1 and, you know, somebody who didn't know all of the grief and  
2 sweat and tears that's gone into it makes it sound, that  
3 percentage rate sounds like we rubber-stamped a whole lot of  
4 these things and I think Sacramento County can testify that  
5 that's not the case.

6 But I do think it is in addition to the good work  
7 of the County it's testimony to the process which we set up  
8 which said we don't just outright reject and we work with  
9 the jurisdictions, we set up a process to work with them to  
10 achieve a compliance and it's not -- the goal is compliance,  
11 not punishment.

12 And I think this individual example serves as a  
13 very good testament to that fact that that works when the  
14 parties involved commit themselves to it, both the local  
15 jurisdiction and our Board staff, who I think has done a  
16 very good job. And it's a win-win-win and I'm very happy  
17 about it.

18 So I will be pleased to entertain a motion, if  
19 there are no more questions or no more discussion, to accept  
20 staff recommendation and forward this to the Board for its  
21 approval. I think we should put it on consent, but also, as  
22 we have with other important ones, highlight in one of the  
23 reports at the beginning of the meeting that this is one of  
24 the items that the Board will be acting on.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: I move Resolution

1 96-184.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: I'll second.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It's been moved and  
4 seconded.

5 We will substitute the prior roll call. Motion  
6 carries three-zip. And it will be on the Board's agenda  
7 this month.

8 Thank you.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Do we need to do the one  
10 for the household hazardous waste?

11 MS. FRIEDMAN: That was already on consent.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: That was on the consent?

13 MS. FRIEDMAN: Correct.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. The next one  
15 is Item 10, which is consideration of the staff  
16 recommendation on the adequacy of the Source Reduction and  
17 Recycling Element for the City of Carlsbad, San Diego  
18 County.

19 Good morning.

20 MS. FRIEDMAN: This presentation will be made by  
21 Claire Miller and John Sitts of the Waste Characterization  
22 and Analysis Branch.

23 MS. MILLER: Good morning, Chairman Chesbro and  
24 Board members. Excuse me, committee members. I'm Claire  
25 Miller of the Waste Characterization and Analysis Branch's

1 South Section.

2 Carlsbad is Item No. 10.

3 Staff is recommending a conditional approval of  
4 the SRRE.

5 The reason for the staff recommendation is that  
6 the City's projection falls below the 25 percent mandate  
7 because of restricted materials and sludge, due to 63 tons  
8 of scrap metal and restricted materials. I mean restricted  
9 materials. And there's also approximately 6500 tons of  
10 sludge in the base year, 8600 tons in 1995 and 9500 tons in  
11 the year 2000.

12 Until the Board approves a petition for the sludge  
13 diversion, it must be taken out.

14 After corrections for the restricted waste and  
15 sludge the City is at 23.5 percent for 1995 and is at 47.9  
16 percent for the year 2000.

17 Because the City's projections fall short of the  
18 mandated goals, therefore staff is recommending a  
19 conditional approval of the SRRE.

20 Staff's recommended condition is for the City to  
21 include in its first annual report a discussion of expansion  
22 of any existing programs or inclusion of additional programs  
23 that will be implemented to reach the 25 percent mandated  
24 diversion goals for 1995 and 2000.

25 The City has also been asked to submit a

1 compliance schedule to the Board within 60 days from the  
2 date of the conditional approval letter, which demonstrates  
3 how the City will correct its deficiencies.

4 The City may also submit a petition to meet  
5 requirements for counting sludge as diversion.

6 The staff has been in communication with the City  
7 and they understand the condition of the staff's  
8 recommendations.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. Any questions  
10 of staff?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Let me just comment that  
12 the sludge is a big item in this case because Carlsbad is a  
13 recipient of and is the site of the sewage disposal facility  
14 for seven other jurisdictions, so all of the generation of  
15 sludge is counted against the single entity. And if they're  
16 able to get that into a program where it can be counted, it  
17 becomes a plus.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: That's a two-edged  
19 sword.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Two-edged sword.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It can cut either  
22 way.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Yeah. So I think  
24 they're working in that direction, to my understanding.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It appears to me that

1 if they proceed and achieve what they have stated in terms  
2 of getting the approval for this sludge diversion, that then  
3 that's the only -- that's the one hurdle that they have to  
4 cross in order to get full approval at the Board.

5 MS. FRIEDMAN: That's correct. If they pursue the  
6 petition.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. We had an, I  
8 don't know whether it's like a quinky-dinky or not, but  
9 Janet was pointing out that we have Sacramento, Carlsbad and  
10 Coronado, Coronado is where Janet is from -- fortunately  
11 it's not Arcata, but I am currently residing in Sacramento  
12 County, it's really curious that those three SRREs are the  
13 ones that are on the regular agenda today.

14 MS. MILLER: It took a lot of planning for us to  
15 get it that way.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I'm sure you planned  
17 it that way.

18 Okay. Is there any other questions?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: No other questions?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: No other discussion?

21 If not, I will entertain a motion to accept  
22 staff's recommendation and conditionally approve the SRRE  
23 and forward it to Board's consent agenda.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: So moved, Mr. Chair.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: And seconded.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It's been moved and  
2 seconded.

3 We will substitute the prior roll call. Motion  
4 passes 3-0.

5 The next item is Item 11, which is consideration  
6 of the staff recommendation on the SRRE adequacy for the  
7 City of Coronado in San Diego.

8 MS. MILLER: Yes. The reason for our staff  
9 recommendation is that the City's projection again falls  
10 below the 25 percent mandate because of restricted waste due  
11 to approximately 2,200 tons of restricted materials of other  
12 miscellaneous type.

13 The City's SRRE uses a material composition type,  
14 other miscellaneous. The Board staff is unsure what portion  
15 or whether all of the other miscellaneous type contains any  
16 inert materials, so all of this material is subtracted out  
17 pending any additional information from the City.

18 Projections for Coronado falls slightly below the  
19 25 percent mandate with 23.4 percent in 1995 and 48.6  
20 percent in 2000.

21 Because the City's projections fall short, staff  
22 is recommending conditional approval of the SRRE.

23 Staff's recommended condition is for the City to  
24 provide the Board with additional information as necessary  
25 about new and expanding programs in the City's first annual

1 report.

2 Another strategy the City might use is to provide  
3 the Board with a breakdown of the contents and percentages  
4 of the contents of the other miscellaneous material type.  
5 Other miscellaneous may not even contain any restricted  
6 waste.

7 Should other miscellaneous contain inert solids,  
8 they might submit documentation to the Board to meet the  
9 required criteria to count the restricted material towards  
10 diversion.

11 Staff has been in communication with the City and  
12 they understand the condition and the staff's  
13 recommendations.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. Mr. Frazee.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Yes, sir.

16 Is there any counting of Navy activity in this, in  
17 Coronado's --

18 MS. MILLER: Yes. Their SRRE did include the Navy  
19 waste, Naval waste.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Because it's one that's  
21 a little difficult to count because the Naval Air Station  
22 North Island has an imaginary line running through the  
23 middle of it and part of it's in the City of Coronado and  
24 part of it in the City of San Diego and so I'm not sure how  
25 they go about making that count.

1 MS. MILLER: They actually have two military bases  
2 there.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Yes. They have a fifth  
4 base down the peninsula.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Does staff know  
6 anything about how they make that distinction in terms of  
7 their waste stream, how they determine which was generated  
8 from within which city, which jurisdiction?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: And the carriers tie up,  
10 I believe all of them tie up within the City of Coronado, so  
11 that's a wildly fluctuating number, depending on how many  
12 carriers are in port and how many are not.

13 MS. FRIEDMAN: I think we need to go back and look  
14 at the Source Reduction Recycling Elements for the two  
15 jurisdictions and see how they have actually specifically  
16 allocated it, but we do know that they have.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: They're in agreement  
18 about who gets part. We don't certainly question whether  
19 how much you want to stir it up if they've managed to agree  
20 between themselves about who takes what and that's really  
21 what matters, I guess, is as long as somebody is taking  
22 responsibility for it, then far be it for us to try to  
23 micromanage, but it is a very interesting question.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: We did hold up one of  
25 the cities over in Monterey Bay area over the Fort Ord,

1 which is no longer an entity, so I think we ought to be  
2 consistent.

3 MS. FRIEDMAN: The distinction with Monterey is  
4 those jurisdictions, the three jurisdictions were not in  
5 agreement as to how to allocate the waste or even if they  
6 should allocate the waste. I think there's a big  
7 distinction there between that and the situation in these  
8 two jurisdictions.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Okay.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Okay. Any other  
11 questions?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: No other questions.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: No other questions.

14 Then we will -- I'll entertain a motion to accept  
15 staff's recommendation, conditionally approve the SRRE and  
16 forward it to the Board's consent agenda.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: I'll move Resolution No.  
18 96-193.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: It's been moved.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: Second.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: And seconded.

22 We'll substitute the prior roll call and the  
23 motion carries.

24 Thank you very much.

25 MS. MILLER: Thank you very much.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: The next item, and  
2 for this one when the time comes I'll get out of the way of  
3 the bright light, it's consideration of the approval of the  
4 Uniform Waste Characterization Method, Item 17.

5 Before staff presents this item, I have a few  
6 comments I'd like to make.

7 First of all I'd like to congratulate Nancy and  
8 Eugene for their very hard work on this project. It's been  
9 a long, grueling process and I think they deserve a lot of  
10 credit for their work. And also all the other people who  
11 worked with them who are not here.

12 This method is a result of two and a half years of  
13 hard work by both our staff and the members of the working  
14 group.

15 And although the Board is required to develop a  
16 Uniform Waste Characterization Method for remote regulatory  
17 purposes in certain circumstances, I view this really more  
18 as a local assistance tool for helping local governments  
19 decide on which programs and materials to focus on to  
20 successfully achieve 50 percent. It stands there available  
21 as a tool for all local jurisdictions, not just those who  
22 happen to come into the narrow regulatory framework and  
23 which is required to have it.

24 One of the most exciting aspects of the project  
25 for me is the part that includes a waste characterization

1 database containing information on waste generation and  
2 materials estimated to be typically disposed of by the  
3 generators.

4 Because this information is based on disposal,  
5 local governments will be able to target only those  
6 materials currently being disposed of in landfills. This  
7 method will help save local governments time and money in  
8 their effort to get to 50 percent.

9 And I view it as a key component in the Board's  
10 overall assistance strategy for getting to 50 percent that  
11 we've been talking about. You know, there's a variety of  
12 things we've been working on and we're talking about doing  
13 more, this has been a little bit of a sleeper that we  
14 haven't focused on as a assistance tool, but it really, I  
15 think, has a major component that will be of assistance to  
16 cities and counties who choose to use it in conjunction with  
17 the other assistance tools that we are developing and I hope  
18 we will develop.

19 With that, I will turn this over to staff. And I  
20 understand at some point they're going to lower a screen and  
21 we're going to come in the audience so that we can see this  
22 a little better than we can on these little tiny screens we  
23 have up here.

24 So Nancy.

25 MS. FRIEDMAN: Yes. Nancy Carr and Dr. Eugene

1 Tseng will be making the presentation for staff.

2 I would like to remind the committee that the  
3 Board is required to develop a Uniform Waste  
4 Characterization Method per PRC Section 41770(b) and that  
5 was a requirement that was passed with AB 2494.

6 So with that, I'm going to turn the presentation  
7 over to Nancy Carr of the Waste Characterization and  
8 Analysis Branch.

9 MS. CARR: What I just handed out is kind of the  
10 fleshed out method that I'll be discussing later on, so if  
11 you're interested in the details you can look at it, but  
12 I'll be talking about it a little bit later on.

13 Good morning, Chairman Chesbro and committee  
14 members. I'm Nancy Carr from the Waste Characterization and  
15 Analysis Branch and I'm here with Dr. Eugene Tseng from UCLA  
16 to present the Uniform Waste Characterization Method for  
17 your consideration.

18 The Board has developed this method as required by  
19 AB 2494 according to Public Resources Code Section 41770.

20 If approved by the Board, this method will be the  
21 State standard all jurisdictions must use when they collect  
22 data that will be submitted to the Board in future revisions  
23 of their Source Reduction and Recycling Elements.

24 There are several advantages to having a statewide  
25 standard method.

1           The method can provide technical guidance to  
2 jurisdictions to help them avoid the data collection  
3 problems which many jurisdictions encountered in doing their  
4 base-year waste characterization studies.

5           The standard method can help achieve a statewide  
6 minimum level of quality and standard format of the data so  
7 that the data can be easily combined and compared in  
8 different regions and for the state as a whole.

9           This may help jurisdictions to use available  
10 standardized data and help them save money and effort on  
11 their data collection for waste management planning.

12           The circumstances for conducting waste  
13 characterization studies are different now from when the  
14 base-year studies were done.

15           Jurisdictions will be required to use this method  
16 only in two instances.

17           The first one that would be when a jurisdiction  
18 fails to meet the 25 percent or 50 percent waste diversion  
19 goals. In that case the Board may direct a jurisdiction to  
20 conduct a waste characterization study and, if so, they must  
21 use this method.

22           The second instance is if a jurisdiction revises  
23 its Source Reduction and Recycling Element and will include  
24 new waste characterization data in that revision it must use  
25 this method for the data that it submits to the Board.

1 Data from new waste characterization studies will  
2 not be used to measure achievement of the goals, but will be  
3 used in planning programs to help reach those goals.

4 Jurisdictions can use waste disposal  
5 characterization data, as Chairman Chesbro stated earlier,  
6 to target what's left in the waste stream to be diverted.  
7 Most jurisdictions will not need to conduct comprehensive  
8 studies on their waste streams, but can do targeted studies  
9 to collect the specific data that they need for their unique  
10 programs.

11 This method has been designed to collect data on  
12 the disposed waste stream only and not to collect  
13 information on what is currently diverted.

14 Some goals of the project have been to design a  
15 flexible method to meet the needs of local jurisdictions,  
16 have the method provide reliable, accurate data for planning  
17 purposes and be cost effective and easy to use.

18 We hope the method will be useful to jurisdictions  
19 even when they were not required to do studies. We hope  
20 that they will still choose to use this method for data  
21 collection for their own purposes.

22 We've already seen some jurisdictions around the  
23 state perform some major data collection efforts to gather  
24 information on their waste streams. They weren't required  
25 to collect this information for the Board's planning

1 purposes, but they chose to collect the information for  
2 their own local planning to reach the 50 percent goal. And  
3 most of those jurisdictions chose to use our draft method  
4 and to cooperate with the project.

5 The method has been developed through really a lot  
6 of cooperative effort. We have an interagency agreement  
7 with UCLA to develop the method and Dr. Tseng is the  
8 principal investigator from UCLA and he's had help from his  
9 students on the project.

10 We have been advised by a public working group of  
11 solid waste experts from both the public and private sector  
12 and they've advised us throughout the project development.  
13 And we'll be presenting their recommendations to you later  
14 on.

15 We've been fortunate enough to have a lot of time,  
16 information and expertise donated by jurisdictions,  
17 consultants and haulers that have really improved the method  
18 and the database that you'll be seeing.

19 And let me just mention that a lot of that is due  
20 to Dr. Tseng's hard work and his very high standing in the  
21 solid waste community in California. People are very  
22 willing to work with him that might be a little reluctant to  
23 work with a State agency and provide that kind of  
24 information we've been able to get.

25 Dr. Tseng estimates that the in-kind contribution

1 that we've had to this project would have cost us over  
2 \$2 million if we would have had to pay for it.

3           Some of the public outreach that we have done  
4 during the project includes in addition to the public  
5 working group meetings, mailings to technical reviewers,  
6 mailings of interim reports on the project to all  
7 jurisdictions in the state, presentations at conferences  
8 such as the California Resource Recycling Association  
9 conference last June, public workshops for local government,  
10 presentations at the National Recycling Coalition meeting at  
11 the national level last fall. And Dr. Tseng has also  
12 presented the project to U.S. EPA staff in Washington, D.C.,  
13 and also spoke at the U.S. Conference of Mayors last year in  
14 Washington, D.C. And finally an article on the project was  
15 published in MSW Management magazine last fall, which I have  
16 here if you'd like to see it. Page 34.

17           The first step in developing the method was to  
18 research existing methods and evaluate them for potential  
19 use as the standard California method.

20           From the evaluation and with input from the  
21 working group we developed a draft method that was tested by  
22 local jurisdictions in the field. From the test results we  
23 modified and improved the method. We discussed the test  
24 results and developed the final proposed method at the last  
25 meeting of the public working group, which was held last

1 month, and that's what we'll be presenting to you today.

2 On page 60 of the agenda packet is the general  
3 outline of the five steps of the method, which I will go  
4 over briefly now, and we handed out to you earlier the  
5 detailed outline which fleshes out each of these steps.

6 In the first step jurisdictions have the  
7 flexibility to choose the data collection approach which is  
8 most appropriate for them.

9 For example, Sonoma County recently conducted a  
10 large landfill study and the cities of San Diego and Los  
11 Angeles recently conducted extensive generator studies where  
12 they collected data from waste disposed by individual  
13 businesses.

14 The use of default data is also an option and  
15 Dr. Tseng will demonstrate the default database in a few  
16 minutes.

17 Jurisdictions can also use data they may have  
18 already collected or data which a similar jurisdiction has  
19 already collected.

20 They can combine approaches for different parts of  
21 their waste stream. For example, they might have existing  
22 data on their residential waste stream and conduct a  
23 generator study on their commercial waste stream. They  
24 could combine that together for the overall waste  
25 characterization study.

1           In the second step the method provides direction  
2           on collecting statistically representative data as required  
3           by statute and Public Resources Code Sections 41032 and  
4           41332.

5           This step also requires that data be collected  
6           which reflects seasonal variation in the waste stream.

7           The working group recommends that sampling in more  
8           than one period not be required, but that it be left up to  
9           jurisdictions to assess their own waste streams and  
10          determine whether sampling in more than one period is  
11          necessary to reflect seasonal variation.

12          This is the only part of the method in which the  
13          project team recommends a modification to the working group  
14          recommendation.

15          We recommend that sampling in more than one season  
16          be actually required by the method, but that jurisdictions  
17          be provided the option of sampling in one period if they  
18          demonstrate that that will be sufficient for their purposes  
19          and receive approval from Board staff prior to the study.  
20          This approval could be similar to what was done with  
21          disposal reporting in jurisdictions which wished to use  
22          alternative systems.

23          I'd like to mention that with this recommendation  
24          from the working group they weren't trying to get by with a  
25          minimum effort or anything like that. They really

1 recognized and supported the need to collect quality data.  
2 And as a matter of fact they even recommended more extensive  
3 sampling and the sample number requirements than we had  
4 originally suggested. I think that this is just a case  
5 where sort of experts disagree on what the requirements  
6 should be. And we think that this will be an issue for  
7 really only a small number of jurisdictions.

8           The working group also conditionally recommended.  
9 the sample numbers included in the method pending further  
10 analysis of a data set from a Northern California  
11 jurisdiction. Dr. Tseng has completed that analysis and it  
12 confirmed our original test results, so we can fully  
13 recommend the sample numbers included in the method.

14           In Step 3 the method requires use of standard  
15 material type definitions and standard field protocols.  
16 This makes sure that data is collected in a consistent  
17 manner and in a consistent level of quality.

18           And by the way, these protocols were used by the  
19 City of San Diego and -- I mean City of Tijuana in a  
20 cross-border waste characterization study that they did in  
21 cooperation with the City of San Diego. And the City of  
22 Tijuana adopted those protocols as their official protocols.

23           Step 4 is included because health and safety  
24 guidelines are critical in field studies.

25           In Step 5 the method provides guidance on

1 analyzing and extrapolating sampling data from field studies  
2 critical. And this is especially important for generator  
3 studies, since that may be a new data collection approach  
4 for jurisdictions and the data extrapolation is a little  
5 more complex for those type of studies.

6 In the method we've tried to achieve a balance  
7 between flexibility for local governments to collect only  
8 the data they need for planning purposes, but also maintain  
9 standardization to have a minimum data quality and  
10 consistency.

11 Dr. Tseng will now show you the most innovative  
12 part of the method, which is the default database, and  
13 demonstrate a couple of ways jurisdictions can use that.

14 And after that demonstration, I'll go over the  
15 recommendation.

16 DR. TSENG: Could you please come up here. And  
17 watch out, because I'm going to lower the screen.

18 Good morning. This is the demonstration that  
19 we've put together on the default database. This is a  
20 package that the Board would have and jurisdictions can use.  
21 And it's designed to accomplish four specific goals.

22 The first is to provide an alternative to disposal  
23 sampling, because the actual field sampling is very  
24 expensive.

25 The second is to assist jurisdictions in their

1 planning to reach 50 percent.

2 And the third goal is allow targeting of the  
3 materials for diversion programs.

4 And the fourth is to get really the biggest bang  
5 for the buck for the selected programs.

6 And I'll demonstrate how this is achieved with  
7 this database.

8 If you watch the little cursor on the left-hand  
9 side of the screen, this is a listing of the 530 something  
10 jurisdictions in the State of California. And a city would  
11 come in here and actually select their city.

12 So we'll take San Diego as an example. That is  
13 the data that we loaded into the database for this  
14 demonstration. So I would select the city. And by  
15 selecting the city it actually automatically uploads all the  
16 zip codes provided by the U.S. Post Office and this is  
17 updated twice a year for -- these are all the zip codes  
18 basically in the City of San Diego.

19 For the purposes of the demonstration, I'm only  
20 going to select one zip code so the program runs a little  
21 faster. And you can see I can select one zip code or I can  
22 select a couple zip codes and put them all together and so  
23 you can actually do regional analysis. And you can actually  
24 load two cities in if you wanted to. But I am going to work  
25 with just one zip code.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Eugene.

2 DR. TSENG: Yes.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: How come it shows San  
4 Diego unincorporated, but doesn't show San Diego City?

5 DR. TSENG: This is San Diego City right here.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: You already pulled it  
7 over.

8 DR. TSENG: I pulled it over.

9 By pushing -- we're trying to make this as user  
10 friendly as possible, so everything is basically  
11 push-button. There's no programming that's needed.

12 With the push of a button what this does is it  
13 shows you the different types of business groupings that  
14 exist in that one zip code. So these are groupings of like  
15 businesses. And we've grouped all the different businesses  
16 into basically 38 different types of business.

17 And what this column here shows is the disposed  
18 tonnage that is calculated for these businesses in that zip  
19 code. This is the relative percentage of the commercial  
20 industrial waste stream.

21 For those people that don't like numbers, we've  
22 actually added a graphical capability. At a quick glance we  
23 can see that business grouping No. 35 looks here, produces  
24 the most waste, about 3500 tons per year. So we can  
25 actually go back and if I'm the recycling coordinator for

1 the jurisdiction, I can say, gee, who do I target, and it's  
2 really the No. 35, they actually have about 3500 tons a year  
3 and they represent almost 17 percent of the entire  
4 commercial industrial waste stream in that one zip code for  
5 the City of San Diego.

6 And if I was recycling coordinator I would say  
7 what kind of waste is recyclable from their waste stream.  
8 So by selecting that business grouping I go and take a look  
9 at the composition.

10 And what this is is the statewide average for all  
11 the services/medical health, which is the largest business  
12 grouping in that zip code. These are all the examples that  
13 we did average together around the state. Okay.

14 And this is the typical solid waste composition by  
15 the broad category. And down here is the more detailed  
16 material types. So you can see for services/medical health,  
17 which is primarily hospitals, it's mostly paper, 63 percent  
18 paper. And at least in that zip code that's over 2,000  
19 tons. And these are the detailed material types. We can  
20 see that the number one material type is other mixed paper.

21 If I wanted to select more detail on just the  
22 glass, I can push that. And that would be just down here  
23 would change to just the details on glass or just the  
24 details on paper or other organics. It gives quite a bit of  
25 level of detail in the different material types, so we can

1 select what to target.

2 Now, as recycler coordinator then I would say,  
3 what's the biggest bang for my buck, who do I approach to  
4 implement a program geared towards services/medical health?  
5 As part of this database, commercially available database,  
6 the Board would have to purchase this, actually would be  
7 able to list the companies in the jurisdictions for actually  
8 the zip code.

9 So here is a list of the companies and we actually  
10 have it prioritized by size. And you can see that the  
11 largest business in the services/medical health is Kaiser  
12 Foundation Hospital. It's a large hospital there. 1800  
13 employees.

14 And if you look at this line here where the cursor  
15 is, in that zip code there's 196 companies and 5600  
16 employees. And getting the biggest bang for the buck means  
17 if I just look at the top three businesses I'm over 5,000  
18 employees there. So maybe just working with three  
19 individual companies I can get probably over 80 percent of  
20 the waste impacted just by working with three, instead of  
21 196, because it's what is called the biggest bang for the  
22 buck.

23 And here we had -- we can select each of the  
24 individual companies and it will give us the detail, the  
25 name of the company, mailing address, the standard

1 industrial classification, and telephone number and the  
2 contact person, so we can actually interface with them.

3 So we built other capabilities which jurisdictions  
4 have asked for, things like if I want to send them a letter,  
5 see if this is running, it actually prepares the mailing  
6 labels for them just like that and it's ready to go.

7 And up here we have form letters so if you want to  
8 do a form letter everything could be programed to print.  
9 And it doesn't have to be sent letter, you can send this via  
10 modem. There's actually a program to do that too.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: You got their e-mail  
12 addresses in the database?

13 DR. TSENG: We can. That is going to be updated.  
14 The commercial database is actually wanting -- that's an  
15 upgrade that they're planning to do actually.

16 So another way a recycling coordinator can look at  
17 this database and can use this is they can say, well, this  
18 is my commercial industrial sector, let me see a little bit  
19 more detail on this. So I push the detail button and for  
20 each of the business groupings gives me the tons, disposed  
21 tons and the relative percentage. And at a very quick  
22 glance it also tells me the number of businesses and the  
23 number of employees in each of these businesses. This is  
24 just a quick screen that gives you a quick overview.

25 Another, following on that, one of the purposes of

1 this is to provide a default composition. You already saw  
2 that we can go to any one of these business groupings and it  
3 would give me the composition for that business group.

4 But it will also do is it can calculate if all  
5 these businesses took their waste to the landfill,  
6 approximately what the composition would be without even  
7 having a sample. So we had this button up here that  
8 provides an overall composition for all these businesses as  
9 if they have taken it to the landfill.

10 So I push that button and it will actually  
11 calculate a composition for you and actually lists what is  
12 the single highest material type that's in the waste stream  
13 with these businesses in the commercial industrial sector of  
14 that zip code.

15 And if I'm a recycling coordinator I would say,  
16 gee, the mixed paper market looks pretty good, or I can say  
17 maybe I want to target plastic film. But you can actually  
18 target a specific material. And I'll say other mixed paper  
19 and double click on that, it actually goes and calculates  
20 which business groups produces the most mixed waste paper.

21 And so this mixed waste screen, what you see is  
22 that we selected other mixed paper as a targeted material  
23 for diversion. It tells me that the number one business  
24 group in that zip code that generates basically 30 percent  
25 of that paper, and it's about 675 tons, is this

1 services/medical health. So you can just see by which  
2 business grouping for most of the paper, recyclables, other  
3 mixed paper is going to be.

4 And again from this screen you can say, okay, I  
5 already -- I can go to the -- I can actually say something  
6 different. A financial, insurance, real estate and I want  
7 to get the mixed paper from there and from here I can go to  
8 the list and the financial, insurance and real estate.

9 And we can actually get individual estimates of  
10 how much paper is like from Wells Fargo Bank. And we have a  
11 button here that will give us an estimate if we went to that  
12 place, based on the number of employees, what the tons of  
13 the different materials from that company, individual  
14 location would be.

15 And this is meant to serve as a planning tool for  
16 jurisdictions and for consultants and recyclers and haulers.

17 You'll be able to distribute this tool the way it  
18 is.

19 Any questions?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: What is the actual  
21 vehicle for placing this in the hands of the jurisdiction?  
22 Is it a disk? Is it -- do they have to have us do it for  
23 them?

24 DR. TSENG: There's many different mechanisms.

25 The way we had initially thought is we would come

1 up here and install a master system, so that you can either  
2 do it through e-mail if you wanted to, that capability is  
3 possible. And we can design a system for that. Or  
4 eventually we can cut a CD and basically if you're cutting  
5 a lot of CDs, and cost for cutting a CD is one to two  
6 dollars a CD, literally. But the problem is that these have  
7 so much data in it, you probably have to cut one disk per  
8 county.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: And then you'd also  
10 have the problem of it being updated as the system's  
11 maintained.

12 DR. TSENG: I think Nancy will be addressing that.  
13 There's data maintenance is the key to making this work.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: The other access  
15 issue is that different jurisdictions will have different  
16 capabilities. You'll have everything from somebody who -- a  
17 jurisdiction that's on line and could plug in through a  
18 modem, to somebody who doesn't even have a computer. And I  
19 think it would be that range. And so I think one of our  
20 dilemmas will be trying to figure out how to meet the needs  
21 of all those different levels of --

22 DR. TSENG: See down here, this little report  
23 button? By selecting this you can actually print the data  
24 behind this to a hard copy and just mail it to them. So we  
25 have a hard copy.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: So as an assistance  
2 activity we could supply for them whatever parts of this  
3 they wanted?

4 DR. TSENG: Absolutely.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: In hard copy.

6 DR. TSENG: We tried to make this pretty user  
7 friendly so training would be pretty minimal.

8 Any other questions?

9 Yes.

10 MR. CUPPS: Yes. I had a question in terms of  
11 developing the default data for specific SIC categories of  
12 businesses. To what extent did you factor in whether or not  
13 in terms of the methodology you used there, did you factor  
14 in at all whether or not those businesses may or may not  
15 have in place diversion programs at the time?

16 DR. TSENG: Yes. We have that detail data for  
17 each of the businesses that we sampled in. We characterized  
18 that. Remember, this is an average, statewide average.  
19 That's actually one of the weaknesses is that it is an  
20 average statewide disposal. So if you went to a company  
21 that actually did a lot of diversion, this is statewide  
22 average, it would not actually be very accurate. They would  
23 actually have less recyclable material here.

24 This is meant really to be a guidance tool. You  
25 can't go to a company and say this is what your waste looks

1 like, because it isn't. You may actually go to a company  
2 that we actually got the reference sample from and because  
3 this is an average it's not going to be exact.

4 MS. CARR: The reason for that is because of AB  
5 2494. This is a disposal characterization method and we no  
6 longer require jurisdictions to collect information on their  
7 diverted waste stream, therefore the database is a disposal  
8 database. And that does bring up this weakness, that  
9 differences in diversion programs aren't going to be  
10 reflected and could be a problem. It's more accurate to  
11 collect generation information and compare that business to  
12 business, but because of AB 2494 and the law we are focusing  
13 on the disposed waste stream. So that's an inherent  
14 weakness in the database.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: There's no way to  
16 factor out, come up with the data to factor out the existing  
17 diversion at the businesses?

18 MS. CARR: Well, if Eugene could have his dream  
19 come true, we would collect data on all those diversion  
20 programs and be able to build a generator database.

21 DR. TSENG: I have a lot of the data already.

22 MS. CARR: That would be a database enhancement  
23 the Board could consider doing if they want to commit the  
24 resources to do that.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: One of the criticisms

1 we've heard from existing recycling collectors is that it  
2 will essentially be putting out data on businesses that  
3 they already are diverting from and sort of advertising that  
4 this business has all this waste that it doesn't actually  
5 have.

6 MS. CARR: This is disposed waste only, not  
7 diverted waste in the database right now.

8 DR. TSENG: Anything else?

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Amazing. Fantastic.

10 DR. TSENG: Thank you.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Truly phenomenal.

12 I was just commenting, a little side conversation  
13 here, about how we've got sort of the technical regulatory  
14 name for this thing, but it means we need to come up with a  
15 user-friendly marketing name to help the nontechnophiles of  
16 the world to quickly grasp its power and its importance,  
17 because I think it has immense potential and power. And  
18 that needs to be transmitted somehow to the policy makers,  
19 elected officials, other people, to understand what we're  
20 doing here.

21 I do have some more questions, but I'll ask them  
22 from up there. Don't run away.

23 DR. TSENG: Okay.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: One of the things  
25 that has occurred to me in relation to this of thinking

1 about when we first started talking about developing  
2 databases four years ago or five years ago, whatever it was,  
3 it was in relation to information for market development and  
4 to what degree the information could be used to help  
5 manufacturers decide where and what capacity and that sort  
6 of thing. And also the local zones and recycling market  
7 development folks to use it for marketing, in essence, to  
8 say look at this material stream we have available.

9 How can this database be used to support the RMDZ  
10 coordinators?

11 DR. TSENG: This database has the capability of  
12 having GIS, which is Geographic Information Systems, on one  
13 of the screens which listed individual businesses. For each  
14 business we actually have what we call a latitude and  
15 longitude designation which is basically a geo code. It  
16 actually pinpoints the location on a map to within plus or  
17 minus 30 feet, literally.

18 So if for a recycling RMDZ coordinator, one of the  
19 biggest questions they get is, well, if I'm going to move my  
20 business in here and I want a film plastics as my raw  
21 materials, how much film plastics is potentially in the  
22 waste stream that I can probably recover? We can literally  
23 say, program in there within 100 miles of my RMDZ, what is  
24 the amount of film plastic in the waste stream. It actually  
25 can calculate that for you. It has that flexibility built

1 in.

2 And one of the largest things, the most important  
3 things that we try to get from our working group in the  
4 jurisdictions is it's really a needs assessment. What do  
5 you want us to put into the database. And that had been  
6 asked before, so that capability is there.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Good.

8 DR. TSENG: Thank you.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Thanks.

10 I assume that that information or that this is  
11 being shared in a cross-divisional way with the Markets and  
12 the zone staff?

13 MS. CARR: Yes; it is.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Relative to its  
15 capability to assist them in their responsibilities.

16 MS. CARR: Yeah. And we actually had an RMDZ  
17 coordinator from the Bay Area in the working group.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Excellent. Okay.

19 You want to go back to your presentation?

20 MS. CARR: Yeah. The last part is the  
21 recommendations.

22 Staff recommends that the Local Assistance and  
23 Planning Committee approve and forward to the Board the  
24 method as recommended by the public working group with the  
25 modification recommended by the project team. That was

1 Option 1 in the agenda packet.

2 This means that the method would be as recommended  
3 by the working group except that sampling would be required  
4 in a minimum of two seasons unless the jurisdiction  
5 demonstrates that sampling in one season meets the needs of  
6 the local study.

7 Staff also recommends that the committee approve  
8 in concept and forward to the Board for consideration the  
9 further recommendations of the working group. And that is  
10 on page 61 of the agenda packet.

11 The working group recommends that the Board  
12 provide resources for default database maintenance and  
13 enhancement. This includes updating the business and waste  
14 composition data to keep the database current with changes  
15 in business and waste patterns in California, incorporating  
16 new data from local jurisdictions' waste characterization  
17 studies as it becomes available, and further refining the  
18 information and database structure as improved software  
19 becomes available.

20 The working group also recommends that they  
21 continue their participation in the project by periodically  
22 reviewing and discussing further developments of the  
23 database and refinement of the method.

24 Finally, Eugene and I would like to recommend that  
25 the Board formally recognize the working group participants

1 and other contributors to the project.

2 This concludes my presentation.

3 Are there any questions?

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Any other questions?

5 There's quite a bit in the recommendation.

6 Basically staff recommendations combined with the working  
7 group recommendations.

8 I would like to add to that formal recognition of  
9 the Board staff who have worked on it and Eugene Tseng for  
10 his immense help to the Board and the people of the State of  
11 California here. Things that multiplied the Board's  
12 resources many times over in terms of what we could have  
13 achieved without that contribution and that hard work and  
14 personal commitment and investment that he's made.

15 So can I have a motion to adopt staff and the  
16 working group's recommendation with the addition that I just  
17 made?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE: So moved.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER GOTCH: And seconded.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Seconded.

21 We will substitute the prior roll call, pass this  
22 3-0. This should not be on consent. I think the full Board  
23 needs to see this and understand it.

24 I assume you will be available, Eugene and Nancy,  
25 to help the Board, the rest of the Board members come up to

1 speed on what this is.

2 And I guess my final comment would be to, once  
3 again, I don't know quite how to do this, but for us to put  
4 our thinking caps on here about marketing in terms of trying  
5 to identify how, in a few words, you can describe this as a  
6 tool beyond its regulatory technical aspects, you know, so  
7 it's more readily graspable by the folks like myself and  
8 others who are policy oriented but not necessarily as strong  
9 on that, the technical and data side.

10 Thank you very much.

11 MS. CARR: Can I say one more thing?

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Sure. Please do.

13 MS. CARR: I'd just like to really thank Eugene  
14 for all his hard work and how much he's helped me and taught  
15 me through this project.

16 And I'd also like to thank my co-workers in the  
17 Waste Characterization and Analysis Branch because they took  
18 on a lot of my workload so I could work more on this  
19 project. And they really helped me a lot and they're a  
20 great group of people to work with. So I wanted to thank  
21 them.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: Acknowledged. Great.  
23 Thanks.

24 Okay. The only things we have left are open  
25 discussion and adjournment.

1           Do we have anything else that any committee  
2 members would like to say? If not, we will adjourn.

3           (Thereupon the meeting was adjourned

4           at 11:55 a.m.)  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, JANET H. NICOL, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I reported the foregoing meeting in shorthand writing; that I thereafter caused my shorthand writing to be transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting, or in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 15th day of May 1996.



Janet H. Nicol  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
License Number 9764